SUMMARY SCORESHEET FOR COMPUTING
PROJECTED HRS SCORE

SITE NAME: Omega Oil Company   Lat/Long: 34° 03' 36"/117° 45' 30"

CITY, COUNTY: Pomona, Los Angeles   T/R/S: 1 South/ 9 West/ Section 26

EPA ID #: CAD009661844

PROGRAM ACCOUNT #: FCA1567RAA

EVALUATOR: Gary Jensen, ICF Technology, Inc.   DATE: February 22, 1991

THIS SCORESHEET IS FOR A: PA ___ SSI ___ LSI ___

OTHER: RCRA-PA _____

RCRA STATUS (Check all that apply):

____ Generator   ____ Small Quantity Generator   ____ Transporter   __X__ TSDF

____ Not listed (date of printout): _/_/_

STATE SUPERFUND STATUS:

___ BEP (_/_/_)   ____ WQARF (_/_/_)   __X__ No State Superfund Status (01/10/90)

PROJECTED PROPOSED REVISED HRS SCORE	S pathway	S^2 pathway
Groundwater Migration Pathway Score (S_{gw})	4.37	19.08
Surface Water Migration Pathway Score (S_{sw})	0.00	0.00
Soil Exposure Pathway Score (S_s)	24.62	606.14
Air Migration Pathway Score (S_a)	0.67 ·	0.45
$S^2_a + S^2_{gw} + S^2_{sw} + S^2_s$		625.67
$(S^2_a + S^2_{gw} + S^2_{sw} + S_s)/4$		156.40
$((S^2_a + S^2_{gw} + S^2_{sw} + S^2_s)/4)^{1/2}$		12.51

*   Pathways not evaluated (explain): Groundwater to surface water pathway not evaluated because the top of the uppermost aquifer is below the bottom of surface water bodies within 1 mile.

GROUNDWATER MIGRATION PATHWAY SCORE SHEET

Factor Categories	Maximum Value	Projected Score	Rationale	Data Quality
Release				
1. Observed Release	550	0	1	E
2. Potential to Release*				
2a. Containment	10	10	2	H
2b. Net Precipitation	10	3	3	E
2c. Depth to Aquifer	5	3	4	H
2d. Travel Time	35	5	4	H
2e. Potential to Release (Lines 2a x (2b+2c+2d))	500	110		E
3. Likelihood of Release (Higher of Lines 1 or 2e)	550	110		E
Waste Characteristics				
4. Toxicity/Mobility	N/A	200	5	E
5. Hazardous Waste Quantity	N/A	10	6	E
6. Waste Characteristics	100	6		
Targets				
7. Maximally Exposed Individual	50	20	7	H
8. Population*				
8a. Level I Concentrations	N/A	0	1	E
8b. Level II Concentrations	N/A	0	1	E
8c. Potential Contamination*	N/A	521	8, see calc.	E
8d. Population (Lines 8a+8b+8c)	N/A	521	8, see calc.	E
9. Resources	5	5	9	E
10. Wellhead Protection Area	20	0	10	H
11. Targets (Lines 7+8d+9+10)	N/A	546		E
12. Aquifer Score [(Lines 3 x 6 x 11) / 82,500]**	100	4.37		
Groundwater Migration Pathway Score				
13. Pathway Score (Sgw), 100 (Highest Value from Line 12 for all aquifers evaluated)	100	4.37		

---

*   Use additional tables

**   These scores are not to be rounded to the nearest integer.

GROUNDWATER

Substance	Toxicity	Mobility	Persistence	Bioaccumulation	Ecosystem Toxicity
Naphthalene	1,000	0.2	0.4	500	1,000
Pyrene	0	2×10^{-9}	1	50	0
Benz(a)anthracene	0	2×10^{-9}	1	50,000	10,000
Benzo(a)pyrene	10	2×10^{-9}	1	50,000	10,000
Lead	10,000	2×10^{-9}	1	5,000	1,000
Toluene	10	0.01	0.4	50	100

2. Potential to Release

Travel Time		
Soil Layer Description	(T) Thickness of Layer (ft)	(HC) Hydraulic Conductivity (cm/sec)
Clay	76	10^{-8}
Sand/gravel	65	10^{-4}

Lowest (HC) = __10^{-8}__   Thickness of Layers With Lowest (HC) = __76 feet__

Travel Time Factor Value (Table 3-7) = 5

Depth to Aquifer = 132 feet   Depth to Aquifer Factor Value (Table 3-5) = 3

Reference: Jensen, Gary, ICF Technology Inc., and Skvarek, Andy, City of Pomona Water Department. Telephone conversation. October 16, 1990.

8. Population

Actual Contamination						
Well Identifier	Contaminant Detected	Concentration (note units)	Benchmark	(A) Apportioned Population Served	(B) Level Multipliers	(A x B)

Multipliers		
Level I = 10		Sum (A x B) Level I ___
Level II = 1		Sum (A x B) Level II ___

Reference:

8. **Populations**

Potential Contamination			
Distance (miles)	Number of Wells	(P) Population	Distance-Weighted Population Value (DWPV) (Table 3-12)
>0 to 1/4	1	4,286	5,214
>1/4 to 1/2	0	0	0
>1/2 to 1	0	0	0
>1 to 2	0	0	0
>2 to 3	0	0	0
>3 to 4	0	0	0

Sum (DWPV) = 5,214

Potential contamination = $\dfrac{\text{Sum (DWPV)}}{10}$ = 521

Reference: Jensen, Gary, ICF Technology Incorporated, and Sihler, Charles, City of Pomona Water District. Telephone conversation. December 10, 1990.

SURFACE WATER MIGRATION PATHWAY SCORESHEET
Overland/Flood Component

Drinking Water Threat

Factor Categories	Maximum Value	Projected Score	Rationale	Data Quality
Release				
1. Observed Release	550	0	11	E
2. Potential to Release by Overland Flow				
2a. Containment	10	10	12	H
2b. Runoff	25	1	13	E
2c. Distance to Surface Water	25	25	14	H
2d. Potential to Release by Overland Flow (Lines 2a x (2b+2c))	500	260		E
3. Potential to Release by Flood				
3a. Containment (Flood)	10	10	15	H
3b. Flood Frequency	50	25	16	E
3c. Potential to Release by Flood (Lines 3a x 3b)	500	250		E
4. Potential to Release (Lines 2d + 3c, subject to a maximum of 500)	500	500		E
5. Likelihood of Release (Higher of Lines 1 or 4)	550	500		E
Waste Characteristics				
6. Toxicity/Persistence	N/A	10,000	5	E
7. Hazardous Waste Quantity	N/A	10	6	E
8. Waste Characteristics (6 x 7, then Table 2-7)	100	18		E
Targets				
9. Maximally Exposed Individual	50	0	17	H
10. Population*				
10a. Level I Concentrations	N/A	0	17	H
10b. Level II Concentrations	N/A	0	17	H
10c. Potential Contamination	N/A	0	17	H
10d. Population (Lines 10a+10b+10c)	N/A	0		H

Drinking Water Threat (Concluded)

Factor Categories	Maximum Value	Projected Score	Rationale	Data Quality
11. Resources	5	0	17	H
12. Targets (Lines 9+10d+11)	N/A	0		H
Drinking Water Threat Score				
13. Drinking Water Threat [(Lines 5 x 8 x 12) / 82,500, subject to a maximum of 100)]	100	0		H
HUMAN FOOD CHAIN THREAT				
Likelihood of Release				
14. Likelihood of Release (Same Value as Line 5)	550	500		E
Waste Characteristics				
15. Toxicity/Persistence/Bioaccumulation	N/A	5×10^7	31	E
16. Hazardous Waste Quantity	N/A	10	6	E
17. Waste Characteristics (Table 2-7)	1,000	56		E
Targets				
18. Food Chain Individual	50	0	17	H
19. Population*				
19a. Level I Concentrations	N/A	0	17	H
19b. Level II Concentrations	N/A	0	17	H
19c. Potential Human Food Chain Contamination	N/A	0	17	H
19d. Population (Lines 19a+19b+19c)	N/A	0		H
20. Targets (Lines 18c+19d)	N/A	0		H
Human Food Chain Threat Score				
21. Human Food Chain Threat [(Lines 14 x 17 x 20)/ 82,500, subject to a maximum of 100]	100	0		E

Environmental Threat

Factor Categories	Maximum Value	Projected Score	Rationale	Data Quality
Environmental Threat				
Likelihood of Release				
22. Likelihood of Release (Same Value as Line 5)	550	500		E
Waste Characteristics				
23. Ecosystem Toxicity/Persistence/Bioaccumulation	N/A	5×10^8	31	E
24. Hazardous Waste Quantity	N/A	10	6	E
25. Waste Characteristics (Table 2-7)	1,000	180		E
Targets				
26. Sensitive Environments*				
26a. Level I Concentrations	N/A	0	18	E
26b. Level II Concentrations	N/A	0	18	E
26c. Potential Contamination	N/A	0	18	E
26d. Sensitive Environments (Lines 26a + 26b + 26c))	N/A	0		E
27. Targets (Value from Line 26d)	N/A	0		E
Environmental Threat Score				
28. Environmental Threat [(Lines 22 x 25 x 27) / 82,500, subject to a maximum of 60]	60	0		
SURFACE WATER OVERLAND/FLOOD COMPONENT SCORE FOR A WATERSHED				
29. Watershed Score** [(Lines 13+21+28), subject to a maximum of 100]	100	0		
SURFACE WATER OVERLAND/FLOOD COMPONENT SCORE				
30. Component Score** (Sof), (Highest of score from Line 29 for all watersheds evaluated, subject to a maximum of 100)	100	0		

---

*   Use additional tables
** These scores are not to be rounded to the nearest integer.

2.   Potential to Release

	Sources	Minimum Size (Y / N)	Containment Factor (Table 4-2)
2. Containment	Tanker Truck	Y	10

2b. Runoff		Value	Assigned Value
1.	2-year, 24-hour rainfall =	3 inches	3
2.	Drainage Area = (Table 4-3)	500 acres	3
3.	Soil Group = (Table 4-4)	A	A
4.	Rainfall/Runoff Value (Table 4-5) =		2
5.	Runoff Factor Value (Table 4-6) =		1

10.   Population

			Actual Contamination			
Intake	Contaminant Detected	Concentration (Note Units)	Benchmark	(A) Apportioned Population Intake Serves	(B) Level* Multiplier	(A x B)

Sum (A x B) Level 1 _____	Sum (A x B) Level II _____

* **Level Multipliers**
Level I = 10
Level II = 1

	Potential Contamination	
Type of Surface Water Body (Dilution)	Population	(A) Dilution-Weighted Population Value (Table 4-14)
<10 cfs	0	0
10 to 100 cfs		
> 100 to 1,000 cfs		
> 1,000 to 10,000 cfs		
> 10,000 to 100,000 cfs		
Shallow ocean zone (depth < 20 ft)		
Moderate ocean zone (depth 20 to 200 ft)		
Deep ocean zone (depth > 200 ft)		
3-mile mixing zone in quiet flowing river ≥ 10 cfs		

Sum (A) __0__

Potential Contamination = $\dfrac{\text{Sum (A)}}{10}$ = __0__

19. **Population**

		Actual Contamination				
Fishery	Contaminant	Concentration	Benchmark	(A) Assigned Population Value (Table 4-18)	(B) Level* Multiplier	(A x B)

Sum (A x B) Level 1 _____   Sum (A x B) Level II _____

* Level Multipliers
  Level I = 10
  Level II = 1

19. **Population** (Continued)

Potential Contamination					
Fishery	Production (lb/yr)	(P) Assigned Population Value (Table 4-18)	Average Stream Flow at Fishery (cfs)	(DW) Dilution Weighting Factor (Table 4-13)	(P x DW)

Sum (P x DW) = _____

Fisheries Subject to Potential Contamination = $\dfrac{\text{Sum (P x DW)}}{10}$ = _____

26. **Sensitive Environments**

Actual Contamination						
Sensitive Environment or Wetland Length (Miles)	Containment	Concentration	Benchmark	(A) Assigned Value (Table 4-23 and/or 4-24)	(B) Level Multiplier*	(A x B)

Sum (A x B) Level I = _____   Sum (A x B) Level II = _____

* **Level Multipliers**

  Level I = 10
  Level II = 1

Sensitive Environment or Wetland Length (Miles)	(A) Assigned Value (Table 4-23 and/or 4-24)	Average Stream Flow (cfs)	(DW) Dilution Weighting Factor (Table 4-13)	(A x DW)

Sum of (A x DW) _____

Potential contamination = $\dfrac{\text{Sum (A x DW)}}{10}$ = _____

SOIL EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORESHEET

Factor Categories	Maximum Value	Projected Score	Rationale	Data Quality
Residential Population Threat				
Likelihood of Exposure				
1. Likelihood of Exposure	550	550	19	H
Waste Characteristics				
2. Toxicity	N/A	10,000	5	E
3. Hazardous Quantity	N/A	10	6	E
4. Waste Characteristics	100	18		
Targets				
5. Resident Individual	50	0	20	H
6. Resident Population				
6a. Level I Concentrations	N/A	0	20	H
6b. Level II Concentrations	N/A	0	20	H
6c. Resident Population (Lines 6a+6b)	N/A	0		H
7. Workers	15	5	21	H
8. Resources	5	0	22	H
9. Terrestrial Sensitive Environments+	N/A	200	23	E
10. Targets (Lines 5+6c+7+8+9)	N/A	205		E
Resident Population Threat Score				
11. Resident Population Threat (Lines 1x4x10)	N/A	2.03×10^6		
Nearby Population Threat				
Likelihood of Exposure				
12. Attractiveness/Accessibility (Table 5-6)	100	5	24	H
13. Area of Contamination (Table 5-7)	100	5	6	H
14. Likelihood of Exposure (Table 5-8)	500	5		H
Waste Characteristics				
15. Toxicity	N/A	10,000	5	E
16. Hazardous Waste Quantity	N/A	10	6	E
17. Waste Characteristics	100	18		E

Factor Categories	Maximum Value	Projected Score	Rationale	Data Quality
Nearby Population Threat				
Targets				
18. Nearby Individual	1	1	25	H
19. Population Within 1 Mile*	N/A	21	26	E
20. Targets (Lines 18+19)	N/A	22		E
Nearby Population Threat Score				
21. Nearby Population Threat (Lines 14x17x20)	N/A	1,980		E
Soil Exposure Pathway Score				
22. Soil Exposure Pathway Score** (S_s), [(Lines 11+21)/82,500, subject to a maximum of 100]	100	24.62		

+ No specific maximum value applies to factor. However, pathway score based solely on terrestrial sensitive environments is limited to maximum of 60.

* Use additional table.

** Do not round to nearest integer.

19. Population Within 1 Mile

Distance (miles)	Population	(A) Distance-Weighted Population Values (Table 5-10)
0 to 1/4	2,637	41
1/4 to 1/2	6,642	65
1/2 to 1	18,817	102

Sum (A) = __208__

Nearby Population Threat Factor Value = $\dfrac{\text{Sum (A)}}{10}$ = 20.8 (21)

Reference: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Toxic Substances. Graphic Exposure Modelling System (GEMS). March 1989.

AIR MIGRATION PATHWAY SCORESHEET

Factor Categories	Maximum Value	Projected Score	Rationale	Data Quality
Likelihood of Release				
1. Observed Release	550	0	27	E
2. Potential to Release	500			
2a. Gas Potential	500	340	28, see calc.	E
2b. Particulate Potential	500	310	29, see calc.	E
2c. Potential to Release (Higher of Lines 2a or 2b)	500	340		E
3. Likelihood of Release (Higher of Lines 1 or 2c)	550	340		E
Waste Characteristics				
4. Toxicity/Mobility	N/A	200	5	E
5. Hazardous Waste Quantity	N/A	10	6	E
6. Waste Characteristics (Table 2-7)	100	6		E
Targets				
7. Nearest Individual	50	7	25	H
8. Population*				
8a. Level I Concentrations	N/A	0	27	E
8b. Level II Concentrations	N/A	0	27	E
8c. Potential Contamination*	N/A	17	30, see calc.	E
8d. Population (Lines 8a+8b+8c)	N/A	17		E
9. Resources	5	0	31	H
10. Sensitive Environments*				
10a. Actual Contamination+	N/A	0	27	E
10b. Potential Contamination+	N/A	3	see calcs.	E
10c. Sensitive Environments (Lines 10a+10b)+	N/A	3		E
11. Targets (Lines 7+8d+9+10c)	N/A	27		E
Air Pathway Migration Score				
12. Pathway Score (S_a) [(Lines 3 x 6 x 11)/82,500]**	100	0.67		

*   Use additional table.

** S_a is not to be rounded to the nearest integer.

+   No specific maximum value applies to factor. However, pathway scores based solely on sensitive environments is limited to a maximum of 60.

Gas Compound	Vapor Press	Henry's Const.	Sum	Table 6-6 Gas Migration Potential (C)	Toxicity
Naphthalene	1.02×10^{-1} (2)	5.5×10^{-4} (2)	4	11	1,000
Pyrene	8.4×10^{-9} (0)	1.7×10^{-8} (0)	0	0	0
Benz(a)anthracene	3.6×10^{-8} (0)	1.9×10^{-6} (1)	1	6	0
Benzo(a)pyrene	5.6×10^{-9} (0)	4.0×10^{-8} (0)	0	0	10
Toluene	7.84×10^{1} (3)	6.8×10^{-3} (3)	6	17	10

Sum of Gas Migration Potential = __34__   Average Gas Migration Potential = __6.8__

Gas Migration Potential Factor Value (Table 6-7) = __6__

Particulate Migration Potential Factor Value (Figure 6-2) = 17

2. Potential to Release

Source	Source Type (Table 6-4)	Gas Containment Factor Value (Table 6-3) (A)	Gas Source Type Factor Value (Table 6-4) (B)	Gas Migration Potential Factor Value (Table 6-7) (C)	Sum (B+C)	Gas Source Value (A x (B+C))
			Gas Potential to Release			
1.	Waste Oil Tank	10	28	6	34	340

Gas Potential to Release Factor Value = <u>250</u>
(Select the highest Gas Source Value)

Source	Source Type (Table 6-4)	Particulate Containment Factor Value (Table 6-9) (A)	Particulate Source Type Factor Value (Table 6-4) (B)	Particulate Migration Potential Factor Value (Table 6-2) (C)	Sum (B+C)	Particulate Source Value (A x (B+C))
			Particulate Potential to Release			
1.	Waste Oil Tank	10	14	17	31	310

Particulate Potential to Release Factor Value = <u>390</u>
(Select the highest Particulate Source Value)

8. **Potential Contamination**

Distance (miles)	Population	(A) Distance-Weighted Population Value (Table 6-17)
On site (0)	8	4
> 0 to 0.25	100	13
> 0.25 to 0.5	200	9
> 0.5 to 1	300	3
> 1 to 2	3,399	27
> 2 to 3	25,067	38
> 3 to 4	44,745	73
> 4		

Sum of (A) = _____167_____

Air Potential Contamination Factor Value = $\dfrac{\text{Sum of (A)}}{10}$ = ____16.7 (17)____

10. **Sensitive Environments**

	Actual Contamination		
Wetland or Type of Sensitive Environment	(A) Sensitive Environment Rating Value (Table 4-23)	(B) Wetland Rating Value (Table 6-18)	(A + B)

Actual Contamination Factor Value [Sum (A + B)] = __

Wetland or Type of Sensitive Environment	(A) Sensitive Environment Rating Value (Table 4-23)	(B) Wetland Rating Value (Table 6-18)	Distance (miles)	(DW) Distance Weights (Table 6-15)	DW x (A + B)
Potential Contamination					
California Black Rail	50		0-1/4	0.25	12.5
Western Yellow Billed Cuckoo	50		0-1/4	0.25	12.5
Least Bells Vireo	100		4	0.0014	0.14

Sum DW x (A + B) =   25.14

Potential Contamination
Sensitive Environments Factor value = $\dfrac{\text{Sum DW x (A + B)}}{10}$ = _____ 2.521 (3) _____

RATIONALE

1. There is no documentation of a release to groundwater from the site and it is not likely that an observed release may documented.

2. There is no run-off containment system present and there is documentation of a spill onto surface soils at the site. (Peterson, Matthew and Jones, Rick, California Department of Health Services. Inspection Report. July 21, 1989.)

3. Net precipitation near the site is 7.8565 inches. (U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Environmental Satellite Data and Information Service, National Climatic Data Center. Comparative Climatic Data for the United States Through 1985. Nashville Tennessee; and Federal Register, Volume 53, Number 247, Proposed Rules, 52029-52030. December 23, 1988.)

4. Depth to the aquifer from which potable water is drawn is approximately 130 feet. Soils underlying an area near the site are composed of alternating layers of sand/gravel and clay. The total thickness of clay undelying the area is 76 feet. (Jensen, Gary, ICF Technology Inc., and Skvarek, Andy, City of Pomona Water Department. Telephone conversation. October 16, 1990.)

5. Total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) were detected in on-site soils. It is assumed that the TPH consisted of napthalene, pyrene, benz(a)anthracene, and benzo(a)pyrene. Toxicity and mobility for the groundwater and air pathways were evaluated using napthalene. The toxicity/persistence value for the surface water pathway was evaluated using lead and napthalene, while the soil exposure pathway was evaluated using only lead.

6. Because the amount of waste oil stored on site during its years of operation as a waste oil recyclery, a default waste quantity value of 10 was assigned for all pathways. (Peterson, Matthew and Jones, Rick, California Department of Health Services. Inspection Report. July 21, 1989.)

7. The nearest drinking water well is located 0.25 miles from the site. The well is one of several wells operated by City of Pomona Water Department which serves drinking water to approximately 120,000 people. (Jensen, Gary, ICF Technology, Inc. to Skvarek, Anthony, City of Pomona Water Department. groundwater and Surface Water Information, Telephone conversation. October 16, 1990).

8. The City of Pomona obtains 10 to 14 percent of its water from a surface water source, San Antonio Canyon, and the remainder of its water from the city's wells. There are a total of 28 wells which serve drinking water to Pomona. Of the wells in the district there is only 1 that draws water from the aquifers which underlie the site. The city wells draw water into resevoirs where the water is blended before being distributed to approximately 120,000 residents. Each well contributes close to the

same amount of water to the system. Thus, approximately 4,286 people are estimated to be served by each well. (Jensen, Gary, ICF Technology Incorporated, and Sihler, Charles, City of Pomona Water District. Telephone conversation. December 10, 1990.)

9. Water in the area is used for drinking purposes. It is assumed that groundwater is also used for commercial food preparation. (Jensen, Gary, ICF Technology, Inc. and Skvarek, Anthony, City of Pomona Water Department. Telephone conversation. October 16, 1990).

10. It is assumed that the site is not in a well head protection area.

11. There is no documentation of a release to the surface water and it is not likely that an observed release may documented.

12. There is evidence of a spill of product oil onto surface soils at the site. (Peterson, Matthew and Jones, Rick, California Department of Health Services. Inspection Report. July 21, 1989.)

13. The run-off value of 1 was based on the following.

   • The 2-year 24-hour rainfall for the site is 3 inches. (U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA, National Weather Service. NOAA Atlas II, Precipitation-Frequency Atlas of the Western United States. Volume XI-California, pg. 61. Silver Spring, MD. 1973.)

   • The drainage area for the site is approximately 500 acres. (U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. San Dimas Quadrangle, California. 7.5 minute series, topographic. 1966, Photorevised 1981.)

   • The site is underlain by soil classified as Type A. (Jensen, Gary, ICF Technology, Inc. and Skvarek, Anthony, City of Pomona Water Department. Telephone conversation. October 16, 1990).

14. The San Jose Creek boarders the site to the south. (Ward, Kim, California Department of Health Services. Inspection Report. August 11, 1987.)

15. There is no certification by a professional engineer that containment at the source is adequate to prevent any washout of hazardous substances.

16. The site lies in a 100 year flood plain. (Jensen, Gary, ICF Technology, Inc., and Patel, Budi, San Bernardino County Department of Land Development. Telephone conversation. October 4, 1990.)

17. The San Jose Creek is a seasonal creek which is not used for drinking water, industrial use water, irrigation water, or for fishing. (Jensen, Gary, ICF Technology,

Inc., and Skvarek, Authory, City of Pomona Water Department. Telephone conversation. October 4, 1990).

18. There are no state or federally threatened or endangered species within 15 miles downstream of the probable point of entry of hazardous substances into the San Jose Creek. (California Department of Fish and Game. Natural Diversity Database, San Dimas, Baldwin Park, and La Habra Quadrangles. April 1, 1989.)

19. Sampling of surface soils indicated levels of TPH at 650 ug/Kg and 1500 ug/Kg within 200 feet of a workplace. (Jensen, Gary, ICF Technology Inc., and Peterson, Matt, California Department of Health Services. Sampling Results at Omega Oil Company. Telephone conversation. December 5, 1990.)

20. There is no resident population at the site.

21. There are approximately 6 workers at the site. (Peterson, Matt, California Department of Health Services. Penalty Worksheet (Omega Oil Company). September 1, 1989.)

22. There is no commercial agriculture, silviculture, or livestock at the site.

23. The site lies within 4 miles of the habitats of at least 3 known state or federally threatened or endangered species. (California Department of Fish and Game. Natural Diversity Database, Ontario and Prado Dam Quadrangles. April 1, 1989.)

24. The site is protected by a continuous chain-link fence. (Operational Plan for a Hazardous Waste Facility. Not dated.)

25. The site is located in an industrial area. The nearest residential area is located approximately 0.25 miles from the site. (Jensen, Gary and Peters, Belinda, ICF Technology, Incorporated. Site drive-by. September 11, 1990; and U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. San Dimas Quadrangle, California. 7.5 minute series (Topographic). 1966. (Photorevised 1981)

26. Approximately 28,096 people live within 1 mile of the site. (Jensen, Gary and Peters, Belinda, ICF Technology, Incorporated. Site drive-by. September 11, 1990; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Toxic Substances. Graphic Exposure Modelling System (GEMS). March 1989.)

27. There is no documented release to the air and it is not likely that an observed release may documented.

28. The gas potential to release value of 340 was based on the following:

   • a source type factor value of 28 based on waste oil tank.

- a gas containment factor default value of 10.

- a gas migration potential factor value of 6 based on the average gas migration potential for all hazardous substances evaluated.

29. The particulate potential to release value of 310 was based on the following:

- a source type factor value of 14 based on waste oil tank.

- a particulate containment factor default value of 10.

- a particulate migration potential factor value of 17 based on the site location.

30. The site is located in a mostly industrial area with a total population of approximately 73,211 people located within 4 miles of the site. (Jensen, Gary and Peters, Belinda, ICF Technology, Incorporated. Site drive-by. September 11, 1990; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Toxic Substances. Graphic Exposure Modelling System (GEMS). March 1989.)

31. There is no known agriculture, silviculture, or major recreation area within 1/2 mile of the site. (Jensen, Gary and Peters, Belinda, ICF Technology, Incorporated. Site drive-by. September 11, 1990; and U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. San Dimas Quadrangle, California. 7.5 minute series, topographic. 1966, photorevised 1981)

32. For the surface water pathway, the toxicity/persistence/bioaccumulation and the ecosystem toxicity/persistence/bioaccumulation values were evaluated using benzo(a)pyrene.